



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,943	04/12/2001	Kristine J. Wilson	RA 5327 (USYS.020PA)	3237

27516 7590 11/15/2004

UNISYS CORPORATION
MS 4773
PO BOX 64942
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942

EXAMINER

SUAZO, RAINIER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2144

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/833,943

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examiner

Rainier Suazo

Art Unit

2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-18 presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,671,756 B1), hereinafter referenced to as Thomas.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Thomas taught a computer-implemented method for operating a data processing system, the data processing system arranged to host an operating system that is coupled to a management interface processor, wherein the management interface processor is coupled to a network having a plurality of computer systems coupled thereto, comprising: initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems; one or more instances of an independently operable console view (abstract, column 3 lines 3.7-56 and column 25 lines 1-19); instantiating on the management interface processor one or more logical console objects (column 5 lines 36-67 and column 25 lines 63-67); initiating on one or more selected ones of the

Art Unit: 2144

computer systems one or more instances of a system operations program (Fig. 11); coupling the one or more instances of the system operations program to respective logical console objects (Fig. 9 and column 8 lines 34-46); in response to user-initiated connection requests, coupling each instance of the console view to a selected instance of the system operations program ; and transmitting data received from a console view from instances of the system operations program to respectively coupled logical console objects and transmitting data received from the logical console objects to one or more instances of a console view (Fig. 4, column 11-36, column 25 lines 12-24 and column 26 lines 1-24).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Thomas taught methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means further comprising displaying data received at an instance of a console view in a manner consistent with a first set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view (Fig. 14, column 20 lines 52-65, column 25 lines 34-38).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Thomas taught methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means further comprising selecting a subset of data from data received at an instance of a console view as a function of a second set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view; and displaying the subset of data at the instance of the console view (Fig. 14-15, column 20 lines 52-65, column 25 lines 34-38, column 25 lines 52-58).

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Thomas taught methods or apparatuses further comprising steps or means for initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems one or more instances of an independently operable console view (abstract,

Fig. 1, column 4 lines 59-54, column 24 lines 63-67 and column 25 lines 1-19); means for instantiating on the management interface processor one or more logical console objects (column 8 lines 5-11, column 25 lines 10-19); means for initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems one or more instances of a system operations program (column 8 lines 34-46, column 25 lines 10-19); means for coupling the one or more instances of the system operations program to respective logical console objects (column 8 lines 26-33, column 25 lines 20-25); and means for coupling each instance of the console view to a selected instance of the system operations program in response to user-initiated connection requests; and means for transmitting data received from a console view from instances of the system operations program to respectively coupled logical console objects and transmitting data received from the logical console objects to one or more instances of a console view (column 8 lines 19-33, column 25 lines 12-24 and column 26 lines 1-24).

Regarding claims 13 and 16, Thomas taught methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means further comprising a computing arrangement for operating a data processing system, comprising: a data processing system hosting an operating system a management interface processor coupled to the data processing system and hosting a plurality of logical console objects, each logical console object coupled to the operating system (abstract, Fig. 1, column 4 lines 59-54, column 24 lines 63-67, column 25 lines 1-8 and column 25 lines 20-25); an operations sever computer system hosting a plurality of instances of a system operations program , each instance of the system operations program coupled to a respective logical console object (column 8 lines 5-11

Art Unit: 2144

and column 25 lines 9-12); one or more display stations hosting independently operable instances of a console view, each instance of the console view coupled to a selected instance of the system operations program (Fig. 8, column 25 lines 9-24) and configured to provide a user interface for operating the data processing system, wherein the system operations program is configured to transmit data received from a console view to a respectively coupled logical console object and transmit data received from a logical console object to one or more instances of a console view (Fig. 8, column 23 lines 8-19, column 7 lines 29-32 and column 26 lines 1-24).

Regarding claims 14 and 17, Thomas taught methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means wherein each instance of the console view is configured to display data received in a manner consistent with a first respective set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view (column 8 lines 5-19 and column 25 lines 34-38).

Regarding claims 15 and 18, Thomas taught methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means wherein each instance of the console view is configured to select a subset of data from data received as a function of a second respective set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view and display the subset of data (column 8 lines 5-19 and column 25 lines 52-58).

4. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by Thomas, claims 1-3, 6-9 and 12-18 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated By Bonnafoux, et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,592,676) hereinafter referenced to as Bonnafoux.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Bonnafoux taught a system/method for operating a data processing system, the data processing system arranged to host an operating system that is coupled to a management interface processor, wherein the management interface processor is coupled to a network having a plurality of computer systems coupled thereto, comprising: initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems; one or more instances of an independently operable console view (abstract, fig. 1-4, column 11 lines 12-19); instantiating on the management interface processor one or more logical console objects (fig. 5 and column 11 lines 46-50); initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems one or more instances of a system operations program (column 11 lines 20-21); coupling the one or more instances of the system operations program to respective logical console objects (column 11 lines 29-39 and 46-52); in response to user-initiated connection requests, coupling each instance of the console view to a selected instance of the system operations program ; and

transmitting data received from a console view from instances of the system operations program to respectively coupled logical console objects and transmitting data received from the logical console objects to one or more instances of a console view (column 2 lines 44-62 and column 13 lines 35-55).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Bonnafoux taught a method or system comprising steps or means further comprising displaying data received at an instance of a console view in a manner consistent with a first set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view (column 11 lines 26-29 and column 4 lines 52-65).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Bonnafoux taught a method or system comprising steps or means further comprising selecting a subset of data from data received at an instance of a console view as a function of a second set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view; and displaying the subset of data at the instance of the console view (column 4 lines 52-65).

Regarding claims 4 and 10, Bonnafoux taught a method or system comprising steps or means further comprising at least one of the one or more instances of the console view executes on a computer system other than the computer system on which the coupled instance of the system operations program executes (Fig. 4 and column 6 lines 4-24 and 33-39).

Regarding claims 6 and 12, Bonnafoux taught methods or systems further comprising steps or means for initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems one or more instances of an independently operable console view (abstract, fig. 1-5, column 11 lines 12-19 and column 11 lines 46-50); means for instantiating on

Art Unit: 2144

the management interface processor one or more logical console objects; means for initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems one or more instances of a system operations program (abstract and column 11 lines 20-29); means for coupling the one or more instances of the system operations program to respective logical console objects (column 11 lines 29-39 and 46-52); and means for coupling each instance of the console view to a selected instance of the system operations program in response to user-initiated connection requests; and means for transmitting data received from a console view from instances of the system operations program to respectively coupled logical console objects and transmitting data received from the logical console objects to one or more instances of a console view (fig. 4-5, column 2 lines 44-62 and column 13 lines 35-55).

Regarding claims 13 and 16, Bonnafoux taught methods or systems further comprising steps or means further comprising a computing arrangement for operating a data processing system, comprising: a data processing system hosting an operating system a management interface processor coupled to the data processing system and hosting a plurality of logical console objects, each logical console object coupled to the operating system (abstract, column 11 lines 13-19, 29-39 and 46-52); an operations sever computer system hosting a plurality of instances of a system operations program each instance of the system operations program coupled to a respective logical console object (column 11 lines 19-25); one or more display stations hosting independently operable instances of a console view, each instance of the console view coupled to a selected instance of the system operations program (column 11 lines 25-29) and

Art Unit: 2144

configured to provide a user interface for operating the data processing system, wherein the system operations program is configured to transmit data received from a console view to a respectively coupled logical console object and transmit data received from a logical console object to one or more instances of a console view (column 13 lines 35-55 and fig. 3 and 4).

Regarding claims 14 and 17, Bonnafoux taught methods or systems further comprising steps or means wherein each instance of the console view is configured to display data received in a manner consistent with a first respective set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view (Fig. 3 and column 4 lines 52-65).

Regarding claims 15 and 18, Bonnafoux taught methods or systems further comprising steps or means wherein each instance of the console view is configured to select a subset of data from data received as a function of a second respective set of configuration parameters associated with the instance of the console view and display the subset of data (Fig. 3 and lines 52-65).

Since all the limitations of claimed invention were disclosed by Bonnafoux, claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-18 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2144

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas, et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,671,756 B1) hereinafter referenced to as Thomas in view of Harple et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,195,091) hereinafter referenced to as Harple.

Regarding claims 4 and 10, Thomas taught the invention substantially as claimed, however Thomas is did not explicitly taught details regarding methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means further comprising at least one of the one or more instances of the console view executes on a computer system other than the computer system on which the coupled instance of the system operations program executes.

Thomas motivates the exploration of the art toward providing alternative architecture for multi-user, multi-computer connections (column 1 lines 57-63).

Harple, in a similar field of invention related to providing access to multiple users, taught a system comprising at least one of the one or more instances of the console view (collaborative computing applications) executes on a computer system other than the computer system on which the coupled instance of the system operations program executes (column 2 lines 33-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the methods/systems of Thomas with the teachings of Harple providing collaborative computing apparatus for multi-user, multi-computer connections (column 2 lines 33-36), to obtain the claimed invention plural console views (or any

Art Unit: 2144

other computer executable code) executing in a distributed manner among different devices (column 3 lines 39-52). Note that distributed computing is a technique well known in the art intended, among other purposes, to balance computer executable code load between central processing devices and/or relatively powerful end-user devices.

7. Since all the limitations of claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Harple and Thomas, claims 4 and 10 are rejected.

8. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonnafoux, et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,592,676) hereinafter referenced to as Bonnafoux in view of Pedersen et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,157,944) hereinafter referenced to as Pedersen.

Regarding claims 5 and 11, Bonnafoux taught the invention substantially as claimed, however Bonnafoux did not explicitly teach methods or apparatuses comprising steps or means further comprising initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems and operations interface program; receiving at the operations interface program a connection request receiving at from an instance of the console view; creating a connection with the instance of the console view; and transferring the connection with the instance of the console view from the operations interface program to an instance of the system operations program.

Pedersen taught methods and apparatus comprising steps and means comprising initiating on one or more selected ones of the computer systems and operations interface program; receiving at the operations interface program a connection request receiving at from an instance of the console view; creating a connection with the

Art Unit: 2144

instance of the console view; and transferring the connection with the instance of the console view from the operations interface program to an instance of the system operations program (abstract, column 1 lines 46-50, column 2 lines 24-26 and column 3 lines 64-67)

Bonnafox motivates the exploration of the art toward easing maintenance in networked environments by suggesting that the use of unsophisticated ergonomics that, required specific knowledge, is an undesired feature (column 1 lines 24-27) in an environment with plural devices coupled and sharing data (Fig. 4).

Bonnafox and Pedersen disclosed inventions in similar fields of endeavor that seeking to minimize requirements such as knowledge and maintenance (Bonnafox, column 1 lines 24-27 & Pedersen, column 1 lines 26-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the methods/systems of Bonnafox with the teachings of Pedersen, for easing maintenance in networked environments transferring a connection initiated in a node to another network node (abstract and column 3 lines 64-67). Note that different connection transfer techniques are well known in the art intended, among other purposes, to collaboration and failure tolerance.

9. Since all the limitations of claimed invention were disclosed by the combination of Pedersen and Bonnafox, claims 5 and 11 are rejected.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Art Unit: 2144

applicant's disclosure. Refer to the enclosed PTO-892 for details.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rainier Suazo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3500